DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 385 JC 020 410

AUTHOR	Sheldon, Debra; Yong, Channing
TITLE	Report on Local Investments of Partnership Funds: Investments for 2000-2001.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	2001-04-00
NOTE	15p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; College Role; *Community Colleges; Degrees (Academic); *Education Work Relationship; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Labor Force Development; *Outcomes of Education; Partnerships in Education; Professional Development; *Program Implementation; Transfer Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

This is a report on how California community college districts have been using their allocation of Partnership for Excellence (PFE) dollars for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Information is gathered from all 108 California community colleges. The colleges report how they have used PFE funds to address the following five community college focus areas for improvement: (1) transfer programs; (2) degrees and certificates; (3) successful course completion; (4) workforce development; and (5) basic skills. The districts were allocated $300 million from the state to address PFE goals. The PFE goals apply to state-level only and are allocated based on colleges' full-time equivalent student (FTES) statistics. Results showed that most colleges used PFE funds to hire new faculty and staff to improve instruction and service across all five areas of emphasis. Approximately 68% of the total PFE funds went to these to areas. Looking at each goal separately, 24% of the PFE funds were used to expand and improve both transfer programs and course completion, 21% to the total dollars were used to improve student degree and certificate attainment, while 16% and 15% of the total PFE funds were used to augment programs in workforce development and basic skills, respectively. Enhancement of facilities, student services, institutional research and technology were other areas where PFE funds were used to improve overall institutional effectiveness. The report provides a list of all community college districts and an appendix with relevant legislation on the PFE program and the use of PFE funds. (MKF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 465 385

Report on Local Investments of Partnership Funds

April 2001

Investments for 2000-2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Nussbaum
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

IC020410

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

BEST COPY AV

Report on
Local Investments of Partnership Funds

Investments for 2000-2001

April 2001

Prepared by
Debra Sheldon and Channing Yong
of the Research and Planning Unit
Policy, Planning, and External Affairs Division
Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
1102 Q Street
Sacramento, California 95814-6511
(916) 322-2818
Fax (916) 324-6073

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Preface ..... *i*

Executive Summary ..... *iii*

Statewide Summary 1

Partnership for Excellence Local Investments, by District, in Alphabetical Order 5

Appendix A **Chaptered Legislation on Partnership for Excellence (Education Code Section 84754)**

Appendix B **Partnership for Excellence Survey of Local Investments of Partnership Funds, January 2001**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Preface

This *Report on Local Investments of Partnership Funds*[1] has been created to show how California Community College districts have been using their Partnership for Excellence dollars for the 2000-01 fiscal year. All 108[2] colleges provided information, which was gathered through the online PFE district reporting survey during January-April 2001. We asked districts and/or colleges to report data on the Partnership activities being undertaken for each goal, the amounts of money which were being allocated for each of the various activities, their object and activity codes as defined in the Chancellor's Office Budget and Accounting Manual, and the numbers of faculty and staff paid and newly hired during the 2000-01 fiscal year.

The report provides a compact single-page summary of each district's expenditures for the 2000-01 fiscal year. Each district and/or college page includes information organized by the five Partnership goal areas: Transfer, Degrees and Certificates, Successful Course Completion, Workforce Preparation, and Basic Skills. When activities were applicable to more than one goal, districts were asked to estimate the percentage of the dollar amount for each activity that was applicable to each goal. That amount was then divided amongst the goals based upon the percentage provided by the district. Easy-to-read bar graphs complement the tabulations of goal-specific fund amounts and staffing information, to assist readers in interpreting key figures.

Our appreciation is extended to the each of the local district and/or college contacts who provided the data for this report and to the following Chancellor's Office staff who were largely responsible for making this report a reality. Debra Sheldon was responsible for overall coordination of the report, the redesign of the survey, and data collection. Chino Lee and Vipul Patel developed the internet-based application of the survey to collect the data and provided excellent ongoing technical support. Channing Yong was a great help in creating graphs for each district. ZoAnn Laurente designed the presentation formats for the individual district and statewide information, and Jeannine Clemons for the report layout and graphics.

Any comments or questions about the report may be directed to Debra Sheldon, (916) 322-2818 or via e-mail at DSheldon@cccco.edu.

Christopher Cabaldon, Vice Chancellor
Policy, Planning, and External Affairs Division

Willard Hom, Director
Research and Planning
April 2001

[1] formerly entitled the *Partnership for Excellence REPORT of Reports*
[2] This number includes the new Copper Mountain College campus that is in the process of being accredited.

Executive Summary

Background of the Partnership for Excellence

The Partnership for Excellence is a mutual commitment by the State of California and the California Community Colleges system to expand significantly the contribution of the community colleges to the social and economic success of California. It is structured in phases, with substantial financial investment by the State in exchange for a credible commitment from the system to specific student and performance outcomes. The State appropriated $100 million in 1998-99, $145 million in 1999-00, and $300 million in 2000-01 for the Partnership.

As its responsibility within the Partnership, the System has committed to achieving by 2005 outcomes which reflect high priority policy objectives of the State. The performance outcomes were derived from the mission of the California Community Colleges, and are projected from 1995-96, 1997-98 or 1998-99 base year data, depending upon the goal. Through the year 2000-01, Partnership for Excellence goals are state-level only and funds are allocated on a Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES) basis. (See Appendix A for the complete legislative text of the Partnership for Excellence.)

After extensive consultation, five performance goals were established in the areas of transfer, degrees and certificates, successful course completion, workforce development, and basic skills improvement. Three of the five goals were then revised by the Board of Governors in July of 2000. A recent report entitled, *System Performance on Partnership for Excellence Goals*[3] (April 2001) presents district- and college-level MIS baseline information specific to the system-wide goals for two fiscal year periods, 1998-99, and 1999-00.

The *Report on Local Investments of Partnership Funds* – Investments for 2000-2001

This report provides a summary of the investments submitted by the colleges for the *Report on Local Investments of Partnership Funds*. (See Appendix B for the district reporting survey.) It was compiled to show how California's community college districts planned to use their allocation of PFE funds for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Districts/colleges were asked to provide information on their planned activities for each goal area; the amounts of money which were being allocated for those different activities, the object and activity codes as defined in the Chancellor's Office Budget and Accounting Manual; and the number of faculty and staff paid and/or newly hired with Partnership dollars. Reports to the Chancellor's Office came by request during January through April 2001. The *Report on Local Investments* is based on complete material from all 108 colleges.

[3] formerly *The Partnership for Excellence FACT Book*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Overview

The California Community College system is using the Partnership for Excellence funds to initiate, augment and expand programs, activities, and services that will contribute to the identified goals. The survey of colleges asked for investment information tied to activities for each of the goals. Taken as a whole, they provide a general sense of the kinds of areas that have been receiving additional attention. Some funds build the capacity of the college to deliver a wide range of improvements across the college (including staff development and technological infrastructure); still others expand the hours of operation, provide additional faculty and staffing, and offer new programs or services which target known needs previously unaddressed.

Our analysis has revealed that various strategies have been employed in investing PFE funds. Some colleges have used PFE monies as augmentations to existing core expenditures already targeting the goals; other colleges used the PFE funds as new dollars for sustained programming, including development and implementation on a larger scale. Often, the integration of these funds with other funds to accomplish what, in so many cases, were existing college goals, also leaves absent the total amount of investments on the target goals and how they extend, and are interwoven with previous efforts. Therefore, conclusions about the merits of the particular investments and their ability to deliver on goals cannot be easily drawn. This report does not contain sufficient information to derive such inferences. What it does provide is indication that every area of instruction and student services is being brought into the effort to reach the PFE goals by 2005.

Systemwide Quantitative Summary and Summaries by Goal

This year's report, as in the prior year, provides on a single page, a compact summary of each district's investments for the current fiscal year. Each district's page includes information separated into the five PFE goal areas: (1) Transfer; (2) Degrees and Certificates; (3) Successful Course Completion; (4) Workforce Preparation; (5) Basic Skills. The grand totals from all of the 108 colleges are provided on a statewide summary sheet immediately following this executive summary. The Statewide Summary shows that as a whole colleges hired or planned to hire 978[4] new full-time faculty, 1,837[4] part-time faculty, and 887[4] non-instructional staff paid in part or entirely from Partnership funds in the 2000-01 fiscal year. The number of employees that were not new hires 2000-01 fiscal year, but were being paid in part or completely from Partnership dollars included 4,818[4] full-time faculty, 3,598[4] part-time faculty, and 1,531[4] non-instructional staff. In addition, the compilation of the individual college and district reports shows that districts invested the entire $300,000,000 total received from the State for the 2000-2001 fiscal year.

[4] Please see page *vi* of this Executive Summary, the "Notes to the Report" section for qualifications regarding these figures for persons hired and/or paid.

Understanding that many activities cross all Partnership goals, and that the following figures are based upon district estimates[5], investments break down in the following ways:

For **Goal 1 – Transfer**, colleges reported:

- Estimated investments for the 2000-01 fiscal year of $70,738,471 or 24% of the total dollars available.

For **Goal 2 – Degrees and Certificates**, colleges reported:

- Estimated investments for the 2000-01 fiscal year of $64,190,248 or 21% of the total dollars available.

For **Goal 3 – Successful Course Completion**, colleges reported:

- Estimated investments for the 2000-01 fiscal year of $72,134,747 or 24% of the total dollars available.

For **Goal 4 – Workforce Development**, colleges reported:

- Estimated investments for the 2000-01 fiscal year of $43,871,217 or 15% of the total dollars available.

For **Goal 5 – Basic Skills**, colleges reported:

- Estimated investments for the 2000-01 fiscal year of $49,065,317 or 16% of the total dollars available.

Areas of Focused Attention

Based on the activity codes of investments colleges provided in the survey, colleges are dedicating their attention and funding to the following areas.

Instructional Areas: All 108 colleges reported planned or actual expenditures in this area. The colleges reported monies being spent on hiring of additional faculty in Basic Skills, Math, and English, various disciplines and workforce development; hiring of librarians; providing faculty and staff development; and developing curriculum. Included here are expenditures addressing remedial and basic skills needs, expenditures to enhance writing, language, and testing labs; to expand course offerings especially in English as a Second Language (ESL); enhanced Career Centers; and acquisition of additional learning resources. This area of focused attention – on increased faculty, instructional support and curriculum – represents the largest proportional share of investments, representing 51 percent of the total for 2000-01.

Student Services: Based on the information provided, it seems that the colleges believe that the expansion of student services is critical to successful attainment of the Partnership goals. Of the 108 colleges 104 indicated hiring expenditures in this area including increases in the number of counselors; tutoring services; education advisors; DSPS – Bridge program and other support; student outreach, Evaluation and Articulation Officers; Financial Aid Officers; admissions and records support; Transfer Center Directors and support staff; and Student Services support in general. Investments in this area represent 17 percent for 2000-01.

[5] Please see "Notes to the Report" section, page *vi*, for qualifications regarding these figures.

Non-Instructional Areas: Activities in this area focus on enhancing services and resources to support instruction and student services. They include expansion of library services (hours of operation, support staff, and book purchases and subscriptions); hiring Learning Center Directors; distance learning; computer support services; computer labs; technical training of faculty; upgraded software; computer network software and support; multi-media resources; enhancement of campus research capability; and hiring researchers. One hundred and one (101) colleges reported investments in this area, which represent about 16 percent of the total dollars for 2000-01.

Infrastructure and Facilities: Ninety (90) of the colleges reported planned or implemented improvements to facilities and other infrastructure enhancements. Some of these funds will be spent to acquire or expand off-site facilities for increased course offerings related to the Partnership for Excellence. Other expenditures include salaries for custodial staff, renovation of labs; renovation of classrooms and equipment; information technology infrastructure; replacement of classroom furniture; and other improvements to campus facilities. Some of the expenditures are viewed as "one-time only" in nature. Total investments of this type represent 11 percent of the total for 2000-01.

The remaining 5 percent of the total expenditures for 2000-01 either had not yet been allocated at the time of the survey, were being used to supplement baseline budgets across all categories, or were set aside for contingencies or miscellaneous projects and programs. Forty-three (43) colleges reported funds in this category.

Notes to the Report

The Chancellor's Office obtained detailed reports from all 108 of the California Community Colleges. Yet readers should be aware of several adjustments and limitations when attempting to draw conclusions from the data presented here.

In reviewing and presenting financial and goal-related information provided by districts and colleges, Research and Planning staff made an adjustment to the data of two districts for creating district and statewide summaries. West Hills and Monterey districts reported expenditures exceeding the Partnership dollars they were allocated, since they also expended general funds towards PFE goals and, in some cases, had difficulty identifying the exact percentage of Partnership vs. general funds attributable to each activity. The figures reported by these districts were adjusted downward to reflect the amount of Partnership dollars actually allocated.

A second limitation is related to the figures on page *v* detailing investments, broken down by each goal area. If an activity addressed more than one goal, districts were asked to estimate the percentages of the dollar amound spent on the activity attributable to each goal. Please be reminded that these figures are based upon the professional judgment and interpretation of those responsible for completing the survey at the district level. They are estimates, not actual amounts, and should be treated as such.

EST COPY AVAILABLE

A third note pertains to changes in the method of analysis from the prior year to this year for the focused areas of attention section of this summary. The analysis contained in this report is based upon dollar amounts and activity codes reported by districts. The analysis for the prior year relied upon hand coding of each activity by Research and Planning staff. As such, the data and the analysis does not support comparisons from one year to the next.

Finally, district and statewide investment totals related to hiring are based on counts of actual persons, not full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. In addition, employees who were paid or newly hired in the 2000-2001 fiscal year entirely out of Partnership dollars and those who were paid only in part from Partnership funds are counted equally. Consequently, hiring figures, especially statewide totals presented in this report, should be taken as estimates.

Statewide Summary

The Statewide Summary can be accessed through the Chancellor's Office homepage at http://www.cccco.edu/cccco/mis/research/LocalInvestReportApr2001/summary.pdf

Local Investments by District

Allan Hancock Joint
Antelope Valley
Barstow
Butte
Cabrillo
Cerritos
Chabot-Las Positas
Chaffey
Citrus
Coast
Compton
Contra Costa
Copper Mountain
Desert
El Camino
Feather River
Foothill-DeAnza
Fremont-Newark
Gavilan Joint
Glendale
Grossmont-Cuyamaca
Hartnell
Imperial
Kern
Lake Tahoe
Lassen
Long Beach
Los Angeles Ed. Svcs. Ctrs.
Los Rios
Marin
Mendocino-Lake
Merced
MiraCosta
Monterey Peninsula
Mt. San Antonio
Mt. San Jacinto
Napa Valley
North Orange Co.
Palo Verde
Palomar
Pasadena Area
Peralta
Rancho Santiago
Redwoods
Rio Hondo
Riverside
San Bernardino
San Diego
San Francisco
San Joaquin Delta
San Jose-Evergreen
San Luis Obispo Co.
San Mateo County
Santa Barbara
Santa Clarita
Santa Monica
Sequoias, College of
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt.
Sierra Joint
Siskiyou Joint
Solano County
Sonoma Co. Jr. Coll. Dist.
South Orange County
Southwestern
State Center
Ventura County
Victor Valley
West Hills
West Kern
West Valley-Mission
Yosemite
Yuba

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

Chaptered Legislation on Partnership for Excellence
(Education Code Section 84754)

Chapter 5. Community College Apportionment
Article 2. Program-Based Funding

84754. (a) The Partnership for Excellence program is hereby established for the purpose of achieving annual performance goals and improving student learning and success. The Partnership for Excellence program is dependent on a mutual commitment by the State of California and the California Community Colleges to achieve statewide goals that reflect the highest priority for the social and economic success of the state. The state intends to provide funding for the Partnership for Excellence program as an investment to supplement funding for enrollment growth and cost-of-living adjustments to invest in program enhancements that will increase performance toward the community college's system outcome measures. The California Community Colleges, as a result of the state's investment, shall commit to improving and achieving specific outcome measures established by the Board of Governors through the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901.

(b) (1) The Board of Governors shall develop, through the consultation process, specific goals and outcome measures to improve student success and assess district performance that will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the areas of transfer, degrees and certificates, successful course completion, work force development, and basic skills improvement. It is intended that the number of system goals not exceed 10. The goals shall be rigorous and challenging to the system, and exceed what could be expected to occur based on increases in funded enrollment. In developing the goals and outcome measures, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall seek the concurrence of the Director of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC).

(2) On or before December 1, 1998, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall propose goals and measures for the approval of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. The Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst, and CPEC each shall assess the extent to which the goals and measures under consideration by the board are clear, reasonable, and adequately meet the state's interest in accountability. The board shall consider the comments of these agencies before approving the goals and measures.

(c) (1) The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall allocate funding for the Partnership for Excellence, pursuant to appropriations in the annual Budget Act, to those districts electing to participate in the program in the 1998-99, 1999-2000, and 2000-01 fiscal years on a per FTES basis, subject to a district minimum allocation, and districts shall have broad flexibility in expending the funds for program enhancement that will improve student success and make progress toward the system goals. Those programs shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, programs that assist students through remediation, tutoring, and mentoring.

(2) Funds provided under this program to districts shall not be considered program improvement funds within the meaning of Sections 84755 and 87482.6, and shall only be spent to improve student learning and success as determined by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges which shall be subject to conditions as the board may determine.

(3) Funds for this program are subject to appropriation in the annual Budget Act.

(d) (1) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges also shall develop, through the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901, one or more contingent funding allocation options, as well as criteria that would require the implementation of these options, that shall link allocation of Partnership for Excellence funds to individual districts to the achievement of and progress toward Partnership for Excellence goals by those individual districts. These contingent funding options may be determined necessary to either improve system performance or to reward significant or sustained achievement.

(2) In developing contingent funding allocation options and criteria for implementation thereof, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall seek the concurrence of the Director of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, and CPEC. These agencies shall each assess the extent to which the contingent allocation options and criteria under consideration by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges are clear, reasonable, and adequately meet the state's interest in accountability. On or before April 15, 2000, the chancellor shall propose to the board one or more contingent funding allocation methods and criteria. The board shall consider the comments of the three agencies before approving the criteria and contingent funding allocation options.

(3) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall have the authority, and shall be accountable, to determine that a funding linkage is needed to adequately improve the performance of the system and its districts and colleges. The board is authorized to allocate all or a portion of Partnership for Excellence funds among districts pursuant to a contingent funding allocation method, as described in this section, commencing in the 2001-02 fiscal year or any fiscal year thereafter as determined necessary by the board. In executing its responsibilities set forth in this subdivision, the board shall engage the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901.

(e) (1) Districts shall report data under the Management Information System (MIS) for each of the outcome measures to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, who shall compile and analyze this data for a report to the Legislature, the Governor, CPEC, and other interested parties by April 15 of each year. The annual reports shall include data for each district and college with respect both to levels of achievement and relative progress towards the goals that recognizes differences in student populations and student preparedness. The chancellor may provide technical assistance to districts, as he or she best determines.

(2) Acceptance of funds from Partnership for Excellence allocations shall constitute concurrence by the district or college to collect and provide to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges all information necessary to quantify baseline performance and annually report changes in outcome measures to the chancellor if, in the judgment of the chancellor, current MIS system data are insufficient for the purpose of any of the approved measures.

(3) Beginning with the report due on April 15, 2001, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall annually assess and report the extent to which achievement of system goals has been satisfactory or less than satisfactory. Based on this assessment and on the criteria adopted as part of the contingent funding allocation plan, the board shall determine, after engaging in the consultation process pursuant to Section 70901, whether or not to implement a contingent funding allocation option described in subdivision (d).

(4) On the basis of the reports specified in this subdivision and other pertinent information, the Legislative Analyst and CPEC shall also annually provide the Legislature their respective assessments of progress toward system goals, and shall recommend necessary changes to the program, including goals and outcome measures. The Legislative Analyst and the CPEC shall recommend ways of improving incentives for districts to contribute toward achievement of system goals.

(f) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2005, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2005, deletes or extends that date.